arXiv:1511.05710v1 [cs.LG] 18 Nov 2015

Complex-Valued Gaussian Processes for Regression: A Widely Non-Linear Approach

Rafael Boloix-Tortosa **Eva Arias-de-Reyna** **F. Javier Payán-Somet** **Juan J. Murillo-Fuentes**
Department of Signal Theory and Communications, University of Seville, Spain.
e-mail: rboloix@us.es. Phone: +34 954488132.

Abstract

In this paper we propose a novel Bayesian kernel based solution for regression in complex fields. We develop the formulation of the Gaussian process for regression (GPR) to deal with complex-valued outputs. Previous solutions for kernels methods usually assume a *complexification* approach, where the real-valued kernel is replaced by a complex-valued one. However, based on the results in complex-valued linear theory, we prove that both a kernel and a *pseudo-kernel* are to be included in the solution. This is the starting point to develop the new formulation for the complex-valued GPR. The obtained formulation resembles the one of the *widely* linear minimum mean-squared (WLMMSE) approach. Just in the particular case where the outputs are proper, the pseudo-kernel cancels and the solution simplifies to a real-valued GPR structure, as the WLMMSE does into a *strictly* linear solution. We include some numerical experiments to show that the novel solution, denoted as widely non-linear complex GPR (WCGPR), outperforms a *strictly* complex GPR where a pseudo-kernel is not included.

1 Introduction

Complex-valued signals are present in the modeling of many systems in a wide range of fields such as optics, electromagnetics, acoustics and telecommunications, among others. The study of linear solutions for complex-valued signals has been addressed in detail in the literature. These solutions can be roughly classified into those that assume properness and those that do not. A proper complex random signal is uncorrelated with its complex conjugate (Neeser and Massey, 1993). In the proper scenario, solutions for the real-valued case can be usually rewritten for the complex-valued scenario by just replacing transpose by Hermitian. However, in the improper case, the solutions are more involved and the concept of *widely* linear is introduced. Accordingly, the linear minimum mean-squared error (LMMSE) can be simply rewritten by taking into account the covariance between two random vectors. However, if the outputs are improper, an additional term must be added to include the pseudo-covariance (Adali et al., 2011; Schreier and Scharf, 2010). Hence, both covariance and pseudo-covariance must be taken into account.

Many non-linear tools for complex fields have been developed within the artificial neural network research community (Danilo P. Mandic, 2009; Hirose, 2013). In kernel methods, we may find a few results for kernel principal analysis (Papaioannou and Zafeiriou, 2014), classification (Steinwart et al., 2006) or regression (Ogunfunmi and Paul, 2011; Bouboulis et al., 2012; Tobar et al., 2012; Boloix-Tortosa et al., 2014). These solutions are usually introduced as a *complexificacion* of the kernel (Bouboulis et al., 2012). In the complexification approach, real-valued kernel tools are adapted to the complex-valued scenario by just rewriting the kernel to deal with complex-valued outputs, and inputs. However, as discussed above for linear solutions, this may suffice for the proper case, but not for the general one. Bearing this in mind, we investigate in this paper how pseudo-covariance matrices should be included in the solutions. In particular, we focus in Gaussian process for regression (GPR).

Gaussian processes (GPs) are kernel Bayesian tools for discriminative machine learning (O'Hagan and Kingman, 1978; Rasmussen and Williams, 2006; Pérez-Cruz et al., 2013). They have been successfully applied to regression, classification and dimensionality reduction.

This work was supported by the Spanish government (Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia, TEC2012-38800-C03-02), and by the European Union (FEDER) and Junta de Andalucía (TIC-155). Copyright 2016 by the authors.

GPs can be interpreted as a family of kernel methods with the additional advantage of providing a full conditional statistical description for the predicted variable. Also, hyperparameters can be learned by maximizing the marginal likelihood, avoiding cross-validation. For real fields, GPs applied to regression can be casted as a non-linear MMSE (Pérez-Cruz et al., 2013): they present a similar structure as the LMMSE, where we replace the linear covariances by kernels, and the regularization term also depends on the prior of the weights of the generalized regression (Rasmussen and Williams, 2006). In the following, we propose to develop a new formulation of GPR for complex-valued signals. We start analyzing the prediction for the real and imaginary part separately. Then we merge the results into a complex-valued formulation. In the general improper case, we show that the solution depends on both a kernel and a pseudo-kernel, to propose a *widely* complex GPR (WCGPR).

2 Widely linear MMSE (WLMMSE) estimation

In this section we review the *widely* concept for complex-valued signals by describing the widely linear minimum mean-squared error (WLMMSE) estimation. The WLMMSE estimation of a zero-mean signal $\mathbf{f}_\bullet : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$ from the zero-mean measurement $\mathbf{y} : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^n$ is (Picinbono and Chevalier, 1995; Schreier and Scharf, 2010)

$$\hat{\mathbf{f}}_\bullet = \mathbf{W}_1\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{W}_2\mathbf{y}^*, \tag{1}$$

or by making use of the augmented notation, where the complex signals are stacked on their conjugates:

$$\underline{\hat{\mathbf{f}}}_\bullet = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{f}}_\bullet \\ \hat{\mathbf{f}}_\bullet^* \end{bmatrix} = \underline{\mathbf{W}}\,\underline{\mathbf{y}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{W}_1 & \mathbf{W}_2 \\ \mathbf{W}_2^* & \mathbf{W}_1^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y} \\ \mathbf{y}^* \end{bmatrix}. \tag{2}$$

The widely linear estimator is determined such that the mean-squared error is minimized, i.e., the error between the augmented estimator and the augmented signal, $\underline{\mathbf{e}} = \underline{\hat{\mathbf{f}}}_\bullet - \underline{\mathbf{f}}_\bullet$, must be orthogonal to the augmented measurement, $\underline{\mathbf{y}}$, (Picinbono and Chevalier, 1995; Schreier and Scharf, 2010):

$$\underline{\mathbf{W}} = \underline{\mathbf{R}}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}}\underline{\mathbf{R}}_{\mathbf{yy}}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}} & \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}}^* & \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}}^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{yy}} & \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{\mathbf{yy}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{\mathbf{yy}}^* & \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{yy}}^* \end{bmatrix}^{-1}, \tag{3}$$

where $\underline{\mathbf{R}}_{\mathbf{yy}}$ is the augmented covariance matrix of the measurements, with covariance matrix $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{yy}} = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}^{\mathrm{H}}\right]$ and pseudo-covariance or complementary covariance matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{\mathbf{yy}} = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}^{\top}\right]$. Similarly, $\underline{\mathbf{R}}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}}$ is composed by $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}} = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}^{\mathrm{H}}\right]$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}} = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}^{\top}\right]$. Now, by using the matrix-inversion lemma in (3), the WLMMSE estimation yields

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathbf{f}}_\bullet = &\left[\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{yy}}^{-*}\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{\mathbf{yy}}^*\right]\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{yy}}^{-1}\mathbf{y} \\ &+ \left[\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{yy}}^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{\mathbf{yy}}\right]\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{yy}}^{-*}\mathbf{y}^*,\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{yy}} = \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{yy}} - \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{\mathbf{yy}}\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{yy}}^{-*}\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{\mathbf{yy}}^*$ is the error covariance matrix for linearly estimating $\mathbf{y}$ from $\mathbf{y}^*$. Finally, the error covariance matrix $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{e}\mathbf{e}^{\mathrm{H}}\right]$ of the error vector $\mathbf{e} = \hat{\mathbf{f}}_\bullet - \mathbf{f}_\bullet$ is (Schreier and Scharf, 2010)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{Q} = &\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{f}_\bullet} - \left[\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{yy}}^{-*}\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{\mathbf{yy}}^*\right]\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{yy}}^{-1}\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}}^{\mathrm{H}} \\ &- \left[\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{yy}}^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{\mathbf{yy}}\right]\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{yy}}^{-*}\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}}^{\mathrm{H}}.\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

It is important to note that the WLMMSE compared to the strictly linear MMSE commonly used fully exploits the dimensions of the problem, including the real and imaginary parts of every signal involved. Just in the case where the error of the LMMSE estimate is orthogonal to $\mathbf{y}^*$ (Schreier and Scharf, 2010),

$$\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{yy}}^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{\mathbf{yy}} = 0, \tag{6}$$

and both estimators provide the same solution $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_\bullet = \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{yy}}^{-1}\mathbf{y}$.

3 Composite Gaussian Processes for Regression

Once we have defined the WLMMSE we next aim at developing the formulation for the GPR, to later relate both results. We first face the case where real and imaginary parts are estimated separately, to later merge the solutions into one complex-valued expression in the next section.

GP for regression can be presented as a nonlinear regressor that expresses the input-output relation through function $f(\mathbf{x})$, known as latent function, that follows a GP and underlies the regression problem

$$y = f(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon, \tag{7}$$

where the input vector is $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^d$, and the error ϵ is modeled as additive zero-mean Gaussian noise.

Given a training set $\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{x}(i), y(i))|i = 1, ..., n\} = \{\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{y}_n\}$, we aggregate the input vectors as columns in matrix $\mathbf{X}_n$ and the outputs are stacked in the complex column vector $\mathbf{y} = [y(1), ..., y(n)]^{\top} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{X}_n) + \epsilon = \mathbf{f} + \epsilon$. The latent function provides the multidimensional Gaussian complex-valued random vector $\mathbf{f} = [f(\mathbf{x}(1)), ..., f(\mathbf{x}(n))]^{\top}$, where $f(\mathbf{x}(i)) \in \mathbb{C}$. The goal of the regression is to predict the value of $\mathbf{f}_\bullet \triangleq [f(\mathbf{x}_\bullet(1)), ..., f(\mathbf{x}_\bullet(m))]^{\top}$ for new inputs $\mathbf{X}_{\bullet m} = [\mathbf{x}_\bullet(1), ..., \mathbf{x}_\bullet(m)]$.

The straightforward way of applying GPR to complex signals is to process a composite vector where we append the imaginary values to the real ones. Then two GPs can be learned, one for the real part and another for the imaginary part of the output, either independently or using a multi-output learning or vector scheme (Micchelli and Pontil, 2005; Boyle and Frean, 2005; Álvarez et al., 2012). The model in (7) can be rewritten in *composite* form as

$$\mathbf{y}_{\mathbb{R}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{r}} \\ \mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{j}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{f}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathbf{X}_n) \\ \mathbf{f}_{\mathrm{j}}(\mathbf{X}_n) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_{\mathrm{r}} \\ \epsilon_{\mathrm{j}} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{f}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbf{X}_n) + \epsilon_{\mathbb{R}}, \tag{8}$$

where $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbb{R}}$, $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\epsilon_{\mathbb{R}}$ are the composite (real) vectors for the outputs, the latent function and the noise, respectively. We assume that the real additive noise $\epsilon_{\mathbb{R}}$ is i.i.d. Gaussian with zero mean and variance $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{\epsilon_{\mathbb{R}}}$. If we assume a zero mean process and specify the covariance function of the process $k_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_l)$, we can write out the corresponding $2n \times 2n$ covariance matrix $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{X}_n)$ elementwise from $\mathbf{X}_n$, and generate the Gaussian prior $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbb{R}} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{X}_n))$. Therefore, the observations are also Gaussian distributed, $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbb{R}} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{X}_n) + \mathbf{\Sigma}_{\epsilon_{\mathbb{R}}}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{R}})$, and the joint distribution of the training outputs, $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbb{R}}$, and the test predictions $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbb{R}_\bullet} = \mathbf{f}_{\mathbb{R}\bullet}(\mathbf{X}_\bullet)$ according to the prior yield

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}_{\mathbb{R}} \\ \mathbf{f}_{\mathbb{R}_\bullet} \end{bmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{0}, \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{R}} & \mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{X}_\bullet) \\ \mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbf{X}_\bullet, \mathbf{X}_n) & \mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbf{X}_\bullet, \mathbf{X}_\bullet) \end{bmatrix}\right). \tag{9}$$

The conditional distribution for the predictions $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbb{R}_\bullet}$ given the observations yields the predictive distribution

$$\mathbf{f}_{\mathbb{R}_\bullet} | \mathbf{X}_\star, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}_{\mathbb{R}} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{\mathbf{f}_{\mathbb{R}_\bullet}}, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{f}_{\mathbb{R}_\bullet}}), \tag{10}$$

and we arrive at the key predictive equations for GPR, the mean and variance given by:

$$\mu_{\mathbf{f}_{\mathbb{R}_\bullet}} = \mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbf{X}_\bullet, \mathbf{X}_n)\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1}\mathbf{y}_{\mathbb{R}}, \tag{11}$$

$$\mathbf{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{f}_{\mathbb{R}_\bullet}} = \mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbf{X}_\bullet, \mathbf{X}_\bullet) - \mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbf{X}_\bullet, \mathbf{X}_n)\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1}\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{X}_\bullet). \tag{12}$$

Note that in the predictions (11) and (12) we have matrices $\mathbf{K}_{\mathrm{rr}}$, $\mathbf{K}_{\mathrm{rj}}$, $\mathbf{K}_{\mathrm{jr}}$ and $\mathbf{K}_{\mathrm{jj}}$, that are block matrices in the vector kernel matrix

$$\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{X}_n) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{K}_{\mathrm{rr}}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{X}_n) & \mathbf{K}_{\mathrm{rj}}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{X}_n) \\ \mathbf{K}_{\mathrm{jr}}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{X}_n) & \mathbf{K}_{\mathrm{jj}}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{X}_n) \end{bmatrix}. \tag{13}$$

4 Widely Complex Gaussian Process Regression

The model in (7) can also be rewritten in the augmented vector notation by stacking the complex signals on their conjugates:

$$\underline{\mathbf{y}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y} \\ \mathbf{y}^* \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{X}_n) \\ \mathbf{f}^*(\mathbf{X}_n) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon \\ \epsilon^* \end{bmatrix} = \underline{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{X}_n) + \underline{\epsilon} = \underline{\mathbf{f}} + \underline{\epsilon}, \tag{14}$$

where $\underline{\mathbf{y}}$, $\underline{\mathbf{f}}$ and $\underline{\epsilon}$ are the augmented vectors for the outputs, the latent function vector and the noise, respectively. There exists a simple relation between the composite vector (8) and the augmented vector (14): $\underline{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{T}\mathbf{y}_{\mathbb{R}}$, where

$$\mathbf{T} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_n & \mathrm{j}\mathbf{I}_n \\ \mathbf{I}_n & -\mathrm{j}\mathbf{I}_n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n}, \tag{15}$$

and $\mathbf{T}\mathbf{T}^{\mathrm{H}} = \mathbf{T}^{\mathrm{H}}\mathbf{T} = 2\mathbf{I}_{2n}$. Also, $\underline{\epsilon} = \mathbf{T}\epsilon_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\underline{\mathbf{f}} = \mathbf{T}\mathbf{f}_{\mathbb{R}}$. This simple transformation allows us to calculate the augmented mean vector and the augmented covariance matrix of the prediction $\mathbf{f}_\bullet$ from (11) and (12), which are $\underline{\mu}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet} = \mathbf{T}\mu_{\mathbf{f}_{\mathbb{R}_\bullet}}$ and $\underline{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet} = \mathbf{T}\mathbf{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{f}_{\mathbb{R}_\bullet}}\mathbf{T}^{\mathrm{H}}$, respectively:

$$\underline{\mu}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet} = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet} \\ \mu_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet}^* \end{bmatrix} = \underline{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{X}_\bullet, \mathbf{X}_n)\underline{\mathbf{C}}^{-1}\underline{\mathbf{y}}, \tag{16}$$

$$\underline{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet} = \underline{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{X}_\bullet, \mathbf{X}_\bullet) - \underline{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{X}_\bullet, \mathbf{X}_n)\underline{\mathbf{C}}^{-1}\underline{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{X}_\bullet), \tag{17}$$

where the augmented covariance matrix of the augmented observations, $\underline{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbb{E}\left[\underline{\mathbf{y}}\underline{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathrm{H}}\right] = \mathbf{T}\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{R}}\mathbf{T}^{\mathrm{H}}$, is defined as

$$\underline{\mathbf{C}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C} & \tilde{\mathbf{C}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^* & \mathbf{C}^* \end{bmatrix} = \underline{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{X}_n) + \underline{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\epsilon = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{X}_n) & \tilde{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{X}_n) \\ \tilde{\mathbf{K}}^*(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{X}_n)^* & \mathbf{K}^*(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{X}_n) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Sigma}_\epsilon & \tilde{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\epsilon \\ \tilde{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\epsilon^* & \mathbf{\Sigma}_\epsilon^* \end{bmatrix}. \tag{18}$$

Matrix $\underline{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\epsilon = \mathbf{T}\Sigma_{\epsilon_{\mathbb{R}}}\mathbf{T}^{\mathrm{H}}$ is the augmented covariance matrix of the noise, and $\underline{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{X}_n) = \mathbf{T}\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{X}_n)\mathbf{T}^{\mathrm{H}}$ is the augmented covariance matrix of $\underline{\mathbf{f}} = \underline{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{X}_n)$, composed by the covariance matrix $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{X}_n) = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{X}_n)\mathbf{f}^{\mathrm{H}}(\mathbf{X}_n)\right]$ and the pseudo-covariance or complementary covariance matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{X}_n) = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{X}_n)\mathbf{f}^{\top}(\mathbf{X}_n)\right]$. Notice that in the general complex case, two functions must be defined to calculate matrices $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{X}_n)$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{X}_n)$, respectively, i.e., we need a covariance function or kernel $k(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_l)$, and a pseudo-covariance function or *pseudo-kernel*, $\tilde{k}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_l)$.

Using the matrix-inversion lemma to find $\underline{\mathbf{C}}^{-1}$ in (16) yields the mean of the prediction

$$\mu_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet} = \left[\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{X}_\bullet, \mathbf{X}_n) - \tilde{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{X}_\bullet, \mathbf{X}_n)\mathbf{C}^{-*}\tilde{\mathbf{C}}^*\right]\mathbf{P}^{-1}\mathbf{y} + \left[\tilde{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{X}_\bullet, \mathbf{X}_n) - \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{X}_\bullet, \mathbf{X}_n)\mathbf{C}^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{C}}\right]\mathbf{P}^{-*}\mathbf{y}^*, \tag{19}$$

where $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{C} - \tilde{\mathbf{C}}\mathbf{C}^{-*}\tilde{\mathbf{C}}^*$.

Also, the covariance matrix yields

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet} &= \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{X}_\bullet, \mathbf{X}_\bullet) \\ &- \left[\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{X}_\bullet, \mathbf{X}) - \tilde{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{X}_\bullet, \mathbf{X})\mathbf{C}^{-*}\tilde{\mathbf{C}}^*\right]\mathbf{P}^{-1}\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}_\bullet) \\ &- \left[\tilde{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{X}_\bullet, \mathbf{X}) - \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{X}_\bullet, \mathbf{X})\mathbf{C}^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{C}}\right]\mathbf{P}^{-*}\tilde{\mathbf{K}}^*(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}_\bullet).\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

4.1 Relation to the widely linear MMSE (WLMMSE) estimation

At this point it is important to remark the similarity of the widely linear MMSE estimation (WLMMSE) with the complex GPR developed above. Notice the similarity between the WLMMSE estimation in (4) and the mean of the complex GPR prediction in (19). The role of matrices $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{yy}}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{\mathbf{yy}}$, $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}}$ in the WLMMSE estimation in (4) is played in the complex GPR prediction in (19) by $\mathbf{C}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$, $\mathbf{K}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}$, respectively, i.e., covariances and pseudo-covariances are replaced by kernels and pseudo-kernels. Therefore, the mean of the proposed complex GPR prediction can be cast as a nonlinear extension to the widely linear MMSE estimation, and we may denote it as widely nonlinear complex GPR (WCGPR). The same kind of similarity is found between the error covariance matrix $\mathbf{Q}$ in (5) and the WCGPR predictive covariance matrix in (20).

In Section 2 we stated that the WLMMSE estimate and the strictly linear MMSE estimate are identical, and equal to $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_\bullet = \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet\mathbf{y}}\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{yy}}^{-1}\mathbf{y}$, if and only if (6) holds. Similarly, in the context of WCGPR the prediction mean (19) simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{\mathbf{f}_\bullet} &= \left[\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{X}_\bullet, \mathbf{X}_n) - \tilde{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{X}_\bullet, \mathbf{X}_n)\mathbf{C}^{-*}\tilde{\mathbf{C}}^*\right]\mathbf{P}^{-1}\mathbf{y} \\ &= \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{X}_\bullet, \mathbf{X}_n)\mathbf{C}^{-1}\mathbf{y},\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

if

$$\left[\tilde{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{X}_\bullet, \mathbf{X}_n) - \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{X}_\bullet, \mathbf{X}_n)\mathbf{C}^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{C}}\right] = 0. \tag{22}$$

This takes place when, e.g. both $\mathbf{f}$ and ϵ are proper. In this scenario, since both $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$ cancel the second term in (19) vanishes. This case is analogous to the strictly linear MMSE and this solution for proper complex GPR, that assumes a null pseudo-covariance, could be denoted as a strictly nonlinear complex GPR. This is the case studied in Boloix-Tortosa et al. (2014). Note that, in the same way that the WLMMSE compared to the strictly linear MMSE fully exploits the dimensions of the problem, the WCGPR presented in this paper also fully exploits the dimensions of the problems, while the complex GPR for the proper case in Boloix-Tortosa et al. (2014) does not. This advantage is highlighted in the next section devoted to experiments.



Figure 1: Widely linear filtering model to generate a complex Gaussian process.

5 Numerical Experiments

We propose the following example where we generated a sample function of a complex Gaussian process, then added a complex Gaussian noise to it, randomly chose training samples and tried to learn the sample function of the process by using (19). In order to generate a complex Gaussian process we followed the procedure in Picinbono and Bondon (1997), and the sample function of the process $f(\mathbf{x})$ can be written as the output of a *widely* linear filter driven by complex proper white, zero-mean, unit-variance noise, $S(\mathbf{x}) = S_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathrm{j}S_{\mathrm{j}}(\mathbf{x})$:

$$\begin{aligned}f(\mathbf{x}) &= (h_{r1}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathrm{j}h_{j1}(\mathbf{x})) \star S(\mathbf{x}) \\ &+ (h_{r2}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathrm{j}h_{j2}(\mathbf{x})) \star S^*(\mathbf{x}).\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

This procedure, sketched in Figure 1, allows for the generation of both proper or improper Gaussian processes with the desired second order statistics. In this example, the filters used were parameterized exponentials:

$$h(\mathbf{x}) = v \exp\left(-\frac{\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{H}}\mathbf{x}}{\gamma}\right), \tag{24}$$

where $\gamma = 0.6$ and $v = 4$ for $h_{r1}(\mathbf{x})$, $v = 5$ for $h_{j1}(\mathbf{x})$, $v = 1$ for $h_{r2}(\mathbf{x})$, and $v = -3$ for $h_{j2}(\mathbf{x})$. We generated 100 samples in $[-5, 5]$ for both the real and the imaginary parts of the inputs to get a set of 10000 complex-valued inputs, and the filters were normalized to have unit norm. The real part of sample function $f(\mathbf{x})$ obtained is shown in Figure 2 (top).

Complex Gaussian noise with variance σ_ϵ^2 and complementary variance $\rho\sigma_\epsilon^2$ was added to represent measurement uncertainty. In this example we set $\sigma_\epsilon = 0.0165$ and $\rho = 0.8\exp(\mathrm{j}3\pi/2)$. A set of $n = 500$ training noisy samples were randomly chosen. These samples have been depicted as circles in Figure 2 (top).

We calculated the mean (19) and variance (20) of the predictive distribution using the training samples. The



Figure 2: Real part of the sample function of a complex Gaussian process $f(\mathbf{x})$ (top) and real part of the mean WCGPR estimation (19) (bottom) versus the real and imaginary parts of the input, x. The training samples are depicted as blue circles.

real part of the predictive mean (19) is depicted in Figure 2 (bottom). The mean squared error of the estimation was $10\log_{10} MSE = -12.6$ dB, computed for 10000 inputs. In Figure 3 a slice of the surface in Figure 2 is shown. The real part of the sample function of the process is plotted (black line) versus the real part of the input, the imaginary part of the input (x) was fixed to the value 0.4545. The real part of the prediction in (19) is depicted in red line, along with the grey shaded area that represents the pointwise mean plus and minus two times the standard deviation. The blue circles mark the training samples.

We have also compared the predictive capabilities of the proposed *widely* complex GPR in (19) with that of the prediction for the proper case in (21). In Figure 3 the mean of the prediction in (21) is plotted as a blue line. It is shown that the proposed WCGPR prediction is always closer to the actual value of $f(\mathbf{x})$ than the prediction for the proper case, as expected.

Finally, in Figure 4 we compare the mean square error of the estimation of the same $f(x)$ as before for the proposed WCGPR (19) and the proper case estimation (21) versus the number of training samples. The noise variance was increased to $\sigma_\epsilon = 0.165$ in order to check the good behavior of the proposed complex-valued regressor under a ten-fold higher noise level.


Real part of the output, $f(x)$
Complex-valued Gaussian Process $f(x)$
Proposed WCGPR
Proper-CGPR
Noisy training samples
Real part of the input, x. (Imaginary part = 0.4545)

Figure 3: Real part of the sample function of a complex Gaussian process $f(\mathbf{x})$ (black line) and real part of the predictive WCGPR mean (19) (red line) versus the real part of the input x. The imaginary part of the inputs is fixed to 0.4545. Training samples are depicted as blue circles. The blue line depicts the predictive mean for the proper CGPR case (21).



Figure 4: Averaged $10\log_{10}(MSE)$ versus the number of training samples for the predictive WCGPR mean (19) and the proper CGPR case (21).

All other parameters were set to the same values used in the previous experiments. It can be seen in Figure 4 that the proposed *widely* complex GPR performs better that the proper case estimation, with a reduction in the MSE close to 2 dB at its best.

6 Conclusion

We have shown that developing complex-valued nonlinear kernel based solutions does not suffice to replace kernels by its complex versions. In the general case, another kernel matrix, the so-called pseudo-kernel matrix must be included. We have focused on GPR to develop a novel formulation, denoted as

widely non-linear complex-valued GPR (WCGPR), after the *widely* linear MMSE, as it exhibits a quite similar structure. The pseudo-kernel or pseudo-covariance matrix in this formulation models the covariance between the outputs and their conjugates. If this pseudo-covariance cancels, i.e. the outputs are proper, WCGPR yields a strict non-linear complex formulation, as the WLMMSE yields a strict LMMSE. Other special cases can be also derived from this general solution. Through numerical experiments we show that the proposed formulation outperforms the strictly non-linear complex-valued GPR when learning a complex Gaussian process generated using widely linear filters.

References

Tülay Adali, Peter J. Schreier, and Louis L. Scharf. Complex-valued signal processing: The proper way to deal with impropriety. *IEEE Trans. on Signal Processing*, pages 5101–5125, 2011.

Mauricio A. Álvarez, Lorenzo Rosasco, and Neil D. Lawrence. Kernels for vector-valued functions: A review. *Found. Trends Mach. Learn.*, 4(3):195–266, March 2012. ISSN 1935-8237. doi: 10.1561/2200000036.

R. Boloix-Tortosa, F.J. Payan-Somet, and J.J. Murillo-Fuentes. Gaussian processes regressors for complex proper signals in digital communications. In *IEEE 8th Sensor Array and Multichannel Signal Processing Workshop, SAM*, pages 137–140, June 2014. doi: 10.1109/SAM.2014.6882359.

P. Bouboulis, S. Theodoridis, and M. Mavroforakis. The augmented complex kernel LMS. *IEEE Trans. on Signal Processing*, 60(9):4962–4967, 2012. ISSN 1053-587X. doi: 10.1109/TSP.2012.2200479.

Phillip Boyle and Marcus Frean. Dependent gaussian processes. In *In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 17*, pages 217–224. MIT Press, 2005.

Vanessa Su Lee Goh Danilo P. Mandic. *Complex Valued Nonlinear Adaptive Filters: Noncircularity, Widely Linear and Neural Models*. Wiley, 2009.

A. Hirose. *Complex-Valued Neural Networks: Advances and Applications*. IEEE Press Series on Computational Intelligence. Wiley, 2013. ISBN 9781118590065.

Charles A. Micchelli and Massimiliano Pontil. On learning vector-valued functions. *Neural Computation*, 17(1):177–204, 2005. doi: 10.1162/0899766052530802.

F.D. Neeser and J.L. Massey. Proper complex random processes with applications to information theory. *IEEE Trans. on Information Theory*, 39(4):1293–1302, Jul 1993. ISSN 0018-9448. doi: 10.1109/18.243446.

Tokunbo Ogunfunmi and Thomas K. Paul. On the complex kernel-based adaptive filter. In *IEEE Int. Symp. on Circuits and Systems, ISCAS*, pages 1263–1266, 2011.

A. O'Hagan and J. F. Kingman. Curve fitting and optimal design for prediction. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B*, 40(1):1783–1816, 1978.

A. Papaioannou and S. Zafeiriou. Principal component analysis with complex kernel: The widely linear model. *IEEE Trans. on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 25(9):1719–1726, Sept 2014. ISSN 2162-237X. doi: 10.1109/TNNLS.2013.2285783.

F. Pérez-Cruz, S. Van Vaerenbergh, J.J. Murillo-Fuentes, M. Lazaro-Gredilla, and I. Santamaria. Gaussian processes for nonlinear signal processing: An overview of recent advances. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 30(4):40–50, July 2013. ISSN 1053-5888. doi: 10.1109/MSP.2013.2250352.

B. Picinbono and P. Bondon. Second-order statistics of complex signals. *IEEE Trans. on Signal Processing*, 45(2):411–420, Feb 1997. ISSN 1053-587X. doi: 10.1109/78.554305.

B. Picinbono and P. Chevalier. Widely linear estimation with complex data. *IEEE Trans. on Signal Processing*, 43(8):2030–2033, Aug 1995. ISSN 1053-587X. doi: 10.1109/78.403373.

C. E. Rasmussen and C. K. I. Williams. *Gaussian Processes for Machine Learning*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2006.

Peter J. Schreier and Louis L. Scharf. *Statistical Signal Processing of Complex-Valued Data. The Theory of Improper and Noncircular Signals*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2010.

I. Steinwart, D. Hush, and C. Scovel. An explicit description of the reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces of Gaussian RBF kernels. *IEEE Trans. on Information Theory*, 52(10):4635–4643, Oct 2006. ISSN 0018-9448. doi: 10.1109/TIT.2006.881713.

F.A. Tobar, A. Kuh, and D.P. Mandic. A novel augmented complex valued kernel LMS. In *IEEE 7th Sensor Array and Multichannel Signal Processing Workshop, SAM*, pages 473–476, 2012. doi: 10.1109/SAM.2012.6250542.